ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 11/2	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED002468	N.A.	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: A Program for the Rehabilitation of Dropouts (A Planning Project)

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: ORG. A Special Project of the Washington Urban League, ST. Washington, D.C. CITY, STATE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: A Special Project of the Washington Urban League, Washington, D.C.

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	11/63	38

TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES [X] NO [ ]

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES [ ] NO [X]

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES [ ] NO [ ]

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL [ ] IN-PROGRESS [ ] FINAL [ ] FOLLOW-UP [ ]

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

dropout rehabilitation	dropout	identification	secondary schools	
dropout characteristics	culturally disadvantaged		delinquency	
dropouts				

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A project to develop a program of rehabilitation that would guide school dropouts back to school or into a learning situation that would provide them with basic educational and job skills was described. The procedures of the project included: developing a pilot program for the rehabilitation of dropouts; renting an office; hiring administrators, counselors, and caseworkers; formulating a list of dropouts; formulating and testing interview forms; locating and interviewing dropouts; holding followup meetings with counselors and the caseworker; and collecting, analyzing, and recommending for revision the findings of the three-month pilot program. The program was based on four assumptions: each year a million boys and girls drop out of school; there should be an early identification of potential dropouts and the initiation of steps by schools and other community agencies to prevent dropouts; when a pupil drops out of school, a rehabilitation agency working in concert with the public schools should take the initiative in recruiting the dropout into a continuous program of guidance and counseling; and a good relationship between a dropout and competent counselor should be established to help the dropout develop high aspirations and a positive self-concept.

Characteristics of dropouts were determined. Personal characteristics included age, sex, marital status, number of own children, and the support of such children. Home characteristics included family size, mobility, support, and health conditions. Educational characteristics included last grade completed in school, reasons for leaving school, and general attitude toward school. Delinquent characteristics included involvement with police and incarcerations. Most dropouts wanted either to return to school or to obtain job training.

ERIC No. 18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

File
Reader

ED002468

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

A PLANNING PROJECT FOR THE
REHABILITATION OF DROPOUTS
By
A FUTURE FOR JIMMY
A Special Project of the
Washington Urban League
Washington, D. C.

LT0523 ED002468

A PROGRAM FOR THE REHABILITATION OF DROPOUTS

(A PLANNING PROJECT)

By

A FUTURE FOR JIMMY
(A Special Project of the Washington Urban League)
Washington, D. C.

The project was performed pursuant to an agreement
with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vocational
Rehabilitation Administration

Short-term Assistance Planning Grant Number RD-1423-G-64
Project Number 1423-G

September 1, 1963 through November 30, 1963

FOREWORD

The three-month dropout study conducted by A Future for Jimmy office highlights the many problems and confusions, and the hopelessness of young people who are untrained to enter a productive society. The future for a neglected and rejected child--although dark--can be brightened by continuous counseling and guidance.

Special acknowledgements must be given to a number of persons who gave volunteer professional service to the staff. Dr. David Iwamota, a member of the research staff of the National Education Association, served as a consultant to the Jimmy staff. Mr. Robert L. Williams, Jr., supervisory occupational analyst, U. S. Department of Labor, served as chairman of an Advisory Committee. Members of the Committee were Mrs. Mary W. Day and Mrs. Ethel J. Williams, both associate professors, School of Social Work, Howard University; and Mrs. Edith Broida, attorney-at-law. Special appreciation also is due Mr. George E. C. Hayes, attorney-at-law, who was general chairman of A Future for Jimmy Advisory Committee.

Special assistance in training interviewers was given by Mr. John Staggers, assistant director, Community Service Project, Howard University, and his staff. Also assisting the Jimmy staff were twenty interviewers, students of Howard University, and various members of the D. C. public school system. Members of the staff included Miss Carrolle S. Fair, research and counseling; Mr. James W. Fraser and Mr. John H. Brown, Jr., counselors; and Mrs. Shirley R. Amos, secretary. Mrs. Anne B. Turpeau assisted the staff as an editorial consultant.

Mrs. Velma McEwen Strode, ACSW
Director of the Project

Mrs. Dorothy S. Granger, ACSW
Assistant Director

CONTENTS

FOREWORD i

LIST OF TABLES iii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

The Purpose of the Project
The Procedure of the Project
The Organization of the Report

II. A PILOT PROGRAM FOR REHABILITATION OF DROPOUTS..... 4

Certain Assumptions
The Objectives of the Program
The Organization and Staff
Operational Schedule

III. IDENTIFICATION OF DROPOUTS 7

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DROPOUTS 8

Personal Characteristics
Home Characteristics
Educational Characteristics
Delinquent Characteristics

V. FUTURE PLANS AND PROBLEMS 17

VI. FOLLOWUP OF DROPOUTS 19

Followup Procedure
Nature of Assistance and Services Provided
Places of Contact

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 23

APPENDIX A 28

APPENDIX B 32

BIBLIOGRAPHY 34

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	RECLASSIFICATION IN OCTOBER 1963, OF THE 140 SEPTEMBER DROPOUTS	7
2.	AGE OF DROPOUTS, 1963	8
3.	WITH WHOM DROPOUTS LIVE, OCTOBER 1963	10
4.	NUMBER OF SIBLINGS IN HOUSEHOLD	10
5.	TOTAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE HOUSEHOLD	11
6.	OCCUPATIONS OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD	12
7.	MAIN SOURCE OF SUPPORT	12
8.	LAST GRADE COMPLETED BY DROPOUTS, 1963	13
9.	MAIN REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL	14
10.	HELP SOUGHT BY PROSPECTIVE DROPOUTS	14
11.	DROPOUTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL PERSONNEL	16
12.	FUTURE PLANS AND ASPIRATIONS	17
13.	SERVICES REQUESTED AND PROVIDED	21
14	PLACE OF CONTACT	22

I. INTRODUCTION

About 3,800 students dropped out of the public schools of the District of Columbia in 1962-63.[1] This included 5.1 percent of the juniors, 9.3 percent of the senior, and 26.5 percent of the vocational high school students.

> The future of any country which is dependent on the will and wisdom of its citizens is damaged, and irreparably damaged, whenever any of its children are not educated to the fullest extent of his capacity from grade school through graduate school. Today, an estimated four out of ten students in the fifth grade will not even finish high school and that is a waste we cannot afford.

So said President Kennedy in his State of the Union Message to the Congress on January 14, 1962. The following month, he emphasized the gravity of this problem as he spoke before the members of the press. "... Jobs filled by high school graduates rose 30 percent, while jobs for those with no secondary education decreased 25 percent. We must, therefore, combat - intensify our efforts to meet with this problem. ..."[2]

The Purpose of the Project

The major purpose of this project was to develop a program of rehabilitation that would guide school dropouts back into a regular school or into a learning situation that would provide them with basic educational and job skills. The project proposed to develop such a city-wide program of rehabilitation by first developing and implementing a pilot program--involving a limited number of dropouts within a limited geographical area of Washington, D. C. for a period of three months.

The portions of the pilot rehabilitation program that were especially tested were:

1. The effectiveness of the project's method of identifying and locating dropouts.

---

1 Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Department of General Research, Budget, and Legislation, Office of Statistician, Pupil Entries from Maryland, Virginia, and Elsewhere and Reasons for Pupil Discharges, by Levels, from the Regular Day Schools, for the School Year, 1962-63. Washington, D.C.: the School System, July 10, 1963. 4pp.

2 The New York Times, August 2, 1963.

2. The degree of success of the project's approach in establishing initial contact and building a channel of continuous communication between dropouts and counselors.

3. The degree of success of the visiting counselors.

4. The efficacy of neighborhood counseling and referral centers.

Facts gathered by this pilot project were:

1. The characteristics common to Washington's dropouts and the circumstances that led to dropouts.

2. The identification of problems that most frequently trouble Washington's dropouts in their first few months after leaving school.

3. The identification of services that are most needed and requested by dropouts and the availability of agencies that would meet such needs.

A dropout is defined as a pupil who "... leaves school, for any reason except death, before he graduates or completes a program and does not transfer to another school."[3]

The Procedure of the Project

The following five steps were taken in this project. First, a pilot program for the rehabilitation of dropouts was developed. Second, in September 1963, an office was rented; a staff of administrators, counselors and caseworkers was recruited and hired; a list of dropouts was supplied by the schools; interview forms were formulated and tested; twenty interviewers were hired and trained; three neighborhood counseling and referral centers were secured; and educational and occupational literature, appropriate to dropouts, was purchased for general distribution. Third, in October 1963, twenty interviewers were sent out to locate and interview dropouts, three neighborhood counseling and referral centers were opened in the evenings, and selected dropouts were visited by counselors and caseworkers. Fourth, in November 1963, followup with counselors and the caseworker continued, and the neighborhood counseling and two referral centers remained open. Fifth, in December 1963, the findings of the three-month pilot program were collected, analyzed and recommendations for revision of the rehabilitation program were presented.

---

[3] U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Information about dropouts: terms and computations," School Life, May 1963, p. 29.

The Preparation of the Interview Forms

The four-page interview form for dropouts (see Appendix A) contained 32 questions, some having more than one part, and covered basic information about the dropout and his family, dropout's status in school, dropout's future action if not returning to school, dropout's feeling about school, and the interviewer's general evaluation of the interview. The two-page interview form for the parents or guardians contained 32 questions and covered questions similar to those asked dropouts.(see Appendix B). The interview with parents or guardians was used partly as a check for information given by dropouts.

The first draft of the interview forms was criticized by the Advisory Committee of A Future For Jimmy and was revised by Mr. John H. Staggers, assistant director of the Howard University Community Service Project, before the final draft was printed.

Selection and Training of Interviewers

Twenty interviewers were selected from a list of 60 applicants. Each applicant was interviewed and selected on the basis of his academic record and experience. They received four hours training by Mr. Staggers and his staff. The training included an overview of the rehabilitation project, explanation of the interview forms, and demonstration of interview techniques.

The Organization of the Report

This report is divided into seven sections. The first section, the introduction, provides the background and basic information for the project; the second section presents an overview of this pilot program; the third section reports the identification and location of dropouts; and the fourth section presents information gathered by counselors and the caseworker during home visits and in neighborhood counseling and referral centers. The fifth section presents the general characteristics of dropouts revealed by the interview forms; the sixth section identifies certain aspirations and problems of dropouts; and the final section contains the summary and conclusions. A brief bibliography is included, and the appendices contain copies of the interview forms.

II. A PILOT PROGRAM FOR REHABILITATION OF DROPOUTS

This section presents assumptions upon which this program was developed; the objectives of the program; the organization and the staff needed to achieve the objectives; and an operational schedule for planning, implementing, evaluating, and reporting.

Assumptions

This program of rehabilitation of dropouts was developed on four assumptions. The first assumption was based on the fact that each year, a million boys and girls make the wrong decision and drop out of school. By doing so, they doom themselves to failure. That is a waste the country cannot afford. The second assumption was that the first step in the rehabilitation of a dropout is an early identification of potential dropouts and the initiation of steps by schools and other community agencies to prevent dropouts. Nevertheless -- and this was the third assumption -- when a pupil drops out of school, a rehabilitation agency working in concert with the public schools should take the initiative in recruiting the dropout into a continuous program of guidance and counseling. Finally, it was assumed that the best way to convince a dropout that it is possible for him to raise his aspiration and self-concept -- and the best way to stimulate and guide him to reach for higher goals through education and training -- is to establish a frequent face to face relationship between a dropout and a competent counselor.

The Objectives of the Program

The major objective of this rehabilitation program was to guide dropouts back into a regular school or into a learning situation that would provide them with basic educational and job skills. If the dropout had no desire to return to school, the project workers would try to assist him in finding employment. If the dropout already had a job, he was to be encouraged to attend night school. The project demanded a continous program of guidance by a staff of professional counselors and caseworkers.

The project proposed to accomplish these objectives by:

1. Identifying dropouts through the public schools. The public school system would be asked to supply the rehabilitation agency with the names and addresses of every pupil who should have but failed to return to school in September or who dropped out during the school year.

2. Providing immediate followup of the dropouts by an interviewer.

3. Using interviewers to locate the dropouts; establish initial friendly relationships with the dropouts; gather basic information about the dropouts; and, give information about services available to dropouts and make arrangements for such services.

4. Providing counselors and caseworkers for professional services to dropouts in their homes and in three neighborhood counseling and referral centers.

5. Initiating and jointly planning both short and long term programs for dropouts, and making provisions for long term follow-up by counselors.

The Organization and Staff

This pilot program required a central office staff of one full-time director, one full-time assistant director, and one full-time clerical worker. The program called for a field staff of twenty part-time interviewers and three part-time counselors or caseworkers. This program had an advisory committee of nineteen community leaders and school representatives. The work of the project staff was divided in the following manner:

The director of the project, a certified social worker, contacted all schools and people involved in the planning project; recruited and hired staff; organized an advisory committee; formulated interview forms; visited homes of dropouts; coordinated all units of the planning project; provided continuous supervision and evaluation of the project, and published and disseminated the final report.

The assistant director, a certificated social worker, helped formulate interview forms; helped train interviewers; supervised and helped interviewers; kept all records of interviewers; visited homes of dropouts; and took part in the critique of the final report.

The three part-time counselors or caseworkers, all of whom were able to meet school certification requirements, set up and staffed neighborhood counseling centers; made arrangements for referrals; visited homes of dropouts; and took part in the critique of the final report.

Twenty interviewers, all of whom were either college graduates or college students, completed a four-hour orientation and training period learning interviewing techniques. They then each spent four hours daily for five days visiting homes and interviewing dropouts. Ten of the original twenty interviewers were employed for a second week. Working a like number of hours, they helped contact dropouts missed during the first week and did some selected revisiting.

A volunteer advisory counsel of profession and community leaders and school representatives helped with the planning, criticized interview

forms and suggested interview techniques; and took part in the final critique of the report.

One or more volunteer clerical workers helped staff the central office.

Operational Schedule

The duration of this pilot project was September 1, 1963, through November 30, 1963. The operational schedule was as follows:

September 1963

1. Set up a central office for the program.
2. Recruit and hire staff.
3. Secure list of dropouts from schools.
4. Formulate and test interview forms.
5. Train interviewers.
6. Find locations for three neighborhood counseling centers.
7. Purchase educational and occupational literature for general distribution to dropouts.

October 1963

1. Send out interviewers -- October 1-14.
2. Open neighborhood counseling centers.
3. Follow up interviewers with professional counselors and caseworkers.

November 1963

1. Continue follow-up with professional staff.
2. Continue neighborhood counseling centers.
3. Collect, tabulate, and evaluate data from interview forms and information gathered by interviewers and counselors.

December 1963

1. Publish the findings of the three-month pilot project.

III. IDENTIFICATION OF DROPOUTS

The dropouts were identified by three cooperating public secondary schools of the District of Columbia. The names of 140 dropouts were supplied by Dunbar Senior High School, Shaw Junior High School, and Banneker Junior High School in late September 1963. Earlier that summer, the principals of these high schools had estimated their total dropouts, expected in September 1963, would be about 300 pupils. This reduced number of actual dropouts was partly due to the intensive return-to-school campaign undertaken by the classroom teachers, who had visited the homes of their prospective dropouts in late August and encouraged many such pupils to return to school.

Table 1 shows the reclassification of the 140 pupils on the dropout list. This reclassification is based on the information gathered by interviewers in October 1963. The interviewers were able to confirm only 49 pupils (35.0 percent) as dropouts. The interviewers were not able to locate 59 pupils (42.1 percent). The largest proportion of this group represented pupils who moved and left no forwarding address. The next largest proportion represented pupils who supplied faulty addresses to their schools. The interviewers found three runaways whose whereabouts were not known to their parents. The interviewers found four boys and one girl incarcerated. The interviewers found 32 (22.9 percent) of the 140 pupils in school. This number represents 28 pupils who were in regular public schools and 4 pupils who were in night schools. Most of the pupils who were in day schools were in schools other than the schools expecting their return.[4]

TABLE 1.--RECLASSIFICATION IN OCTOBER 1963, OF THE 140 SEPTEMBER DROPOUTS

Reclassification	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
Pupils in school	18.3%	26.3%	32	22.9%
Pupils unable to locate.....	53.3%	33.7%	59	42.1%
Confirmed dropouts.....	28.4%	40.0%	49	35.0%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	60	80	140	

[4] The method of identifying and locating dropouts would have been simpler if a comprehensive list of all dropouts was available at the time it was needed. The dropout list supplied by the schools included a number of students who had dropped out prior to June 1963. Many addresses furnished were not up-to-date, and many were unable to be located by the interviewers. It is possible that the transfer papers for the 32 students found to be in school were not yet processed when the schools compiled their dropout list in late September.

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DROPOUTS

This section discusses the findings relating to personal, home, educational and delinquent characteristics of the dropouts.

Personal Characteristics

Personal characteristics include the dropouts' age, sex, marital status, number of own children, and the support of such children.

Age and Sex

The ages of the dropouts ranged from 14 years to 20 years. (See Table 2). The mean age of the dropouts was 17.0 years and the median age was almost the same, 16.9 years. There was little difference between the mean and median ages of the girls and boys. The largest percentage of dropouts (34.7 percent) was 17 years old; and 69.4 percent of all dropouts terminated their formal education at age 17 or before. The District of Columbia compulsory attendance law sets 16 as the minimum legal age for leaving school; 26.5 percent of the dropouts left school at this age.

The figures would appear to be consistent with the national trend. Most studies of school dropouts, indicate that the greatest proportion of pupils drop out at age 16, and that the age at which the greatest number of pupils drop out of school has been rising. Before 1920, more pupils dropped out of school at 14 and 15 than at any other age. Since 1920, the age has increased to 16 with an increasing number of dropouts at age 17.

TABLE 2.--AGE OF DROPOUTS, 1963

Age	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
14	5.9%	3.1%	2	4.1%
15	0.0%	6.3%	2	4.1%
16	29.4%	25.0%	13	26.5%
17	29.4%	37.5%	17	34.7%
18	17.7%	15.6%	8	16.3%
19	17.6%	9.4%	6	12.2%
20	0.0%	3.1%	1	2.1%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number...	17	32	49	
Mean age.....	17.1	17.0	17.0	
Median age.....	17.0	16.9	16.9	

Among the dropouts studied, 32, or 65 percent, were girls, and 17, or 35 percent were boys. This does not appear to follow the national pattern. In one study conducted at the University of Pittsburgh, Telford Blough analyzed 83 dropout studies and found 69 of the 83 studies showed marked differences in the dropout rate by sex. Of this group, 61 indicated that a higher percentage of boys than girls became dropouts. Only eight observers reported the girls in the majority.[5]

Marital Status and Support of Children

All of the 17 male dropouts were single in October 1963. Of this number, one (6 percent) was father of an expected child, his first; two (12 percent) reported having one child; and one (6 percent) reported having two children. One of the boys said he was supporting his children, and another boy said he planned to support his expected child.

Of the 32 girl-dropouts, 23 (72 percent) were single; 7 (22 percent) were married; and 2 (6 percent) did not reveal their marital status.. Fifteen of these girls (47 percent) were mothers. Eleven of them (34 percent) reported having one child; one (3 percent) had two children; and three (10 percent) had one child and were expecting a second. In addition, nine of the girls (28 percent) reported expecting their first child. A total, therefore, of 12 (38 percent) was pregnant.

In a sentence, 24 (75 percent) of the female dropouts had one or more children or were expecting a child. The same percentage said they were supporting their children or would support their expected child.

Home Characteristics

This part of the report discusses family size, mobility, support and health conditions.

Family Size and Composition

The largest percentage of dropouts, 40.8 percent lived with one parent--their mothers (see Table 3); and 36.7 percent lived with both parents. Two (4 percent) lived with their fathers; one with a guardian, and four with their husbands. A larger percentage of boy-dropouts,

---

[5] Telford Benjamin Blough, A Critical Analysis of Selected Literature on the Problem of School Dropouts. Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Pittsburgh in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: the University, 1956, p. 12.

41.2 percent, than girl-dropouts, 34.4 percent, lived with both parents. A larger percentage of girl-dropouts, 43.8 percent, than boy-dropouts, 35.3 percent, lived with only their mothers.

TABLE 3.--WITH WHOM DROPOUTS LIVE, OCTOBER 1963

Persons	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
Mother	35.3%	43.8%	20	40.8%
Father	5.9%	3.1%	2	4.1%
Both parents	41.2%	34.4%	18	36.7%
Guardian	0.0	3.1%	1	2.0%
Husband	---	12.5%	4	8.2%
Other	17.6%	3.1%	4	8.2%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	

The dropouts had an average of four brothers and sisters living in the same household in October 1963 (see Table 4). Other brothers and sisters may have lived elsewhere. About 29 percent of the dropouts report six or more brothers and sisters living in the same household. A median number of eight persons lived in the same household (see Table 5). The dropouts lived in houses or apartments which had an average of five rooms.

TABLE 4.--NUMBER OF SIBLINGS IN HOUSEHOLD

Siblings	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
None	17.6%	21.9%	10	20.4%
1-5	47.1%	50.0%	24	49.0%
6-10	35.3%	21.9%	13	26.5%
11-15	0.0%	3.1%	1	2.0%
No response	---	3.1%	1	2.1%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	
Mean	4.2	3.8	3.9	
Median	3.5	3.0	3.5	

TABLE 5.--TOTAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE HOUSEHOLD

Number of people	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
1-5	29.4%	25.0%	13	26.5%
6-10	52.9%	59.4%	24	57.1%
11-15	11.8%	12.5%	6	12.3%
No response	5.9%	3.1%	2	4.1%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	
Mean	7.1	7.4	7.3	
Median	7.0	7.5	8.0	

Family Mobility

The great majority of the dropouts are long-time residents of the District of Columbia. Forty-one of the 49 dropouts (about 84 percent) indicated 11 or more years of residence in Washington, D.C. Sex made a difference in the number of years of residence. About 71 percent of the boy- but 91 percent of the girl-dropouts said they lived in the District of Columbia for 11 or more years. About 18 percent of the boy- and 9 percent of the girl-dropouts said they lived 5 or fewer years in the District of Columbia.

The dropouts changed their place of residence an average of 1.1 times in the past 3 years. Sex made little difference in mobility--a mean of 1.3 times for boy- and 1.0 times for girl-dropouts. But a larger percentage of boy-dropouts, 23.5 percent, than girl-dropouts, 9.4 percent, changed their place of residence 3 or more times in the past 3 years.

Family Support

None of the heads of household was engaged in professional work (see Table 6), and none was reported to be in clerical and sales work. Two were in skilled work, 11 (or 22.4 percent) in domestic services, and 17 (34.7 percent) in unskilled work. The percentage of heads of household who were unemployed was 30.6. Only eight (16 percent) of the heads of household was graduated from high schools. About the same percentage finished six or fewer years of formal education.

The father was said to be the main source of support in about one-third of the families (see Table 7). The percentage of male dropouts, 52.9 percent, who indicated fathers to be the main source of support

TABLE 6.--OCCUPATIONS OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD

Occupation	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
Professional	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Clerical and sales	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Skilled	5.9%	3.1%	2	4.1%
Domestic services	11.8%	28.1%	11	22.4%
Unskilled labor	52.9%	25.0%	17	34.7%
Unemployed	29.4%	31.3%	15	30.6%
No response	0.0%	12.5%	4	8.2%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	

was almost twice that of the percentage of female dropouts, 25.0 percent. Mothers were said to be the bread-winners of about one-fourth of the families. About 23.5 percent of the boys and 25 percent of the girls indicated mothers to be their main source of support. Other main source of support named indicated that 14 percent of the families depended on social security or pension funds, and 8 percent depended on public welfare funds. Another 8 percent claimed public welfare funds as a secondary source of support.

TABLE 7.--MAIN SOURCE OF SUPPORT

Source	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
Fathers	52.9%	25.0%	17	34.6%
Mothers	23.5%	25.0%	12	24.5%
Siblings	5.9%	0.0%	1	2.0%
Public Welfare Funds	5.9%	9.4%	4	8.2%
Social Security and/or Pension	11.8%	15.6%	7	14.3%
Husbands	---	12.5%	4	8.2%
Other	---	12.5%	4	8.2%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	

Health Conditions

About 41 percent of the 49 families of dropouts indicated the presence of some type of major illness or disability in the household, and about 12 percent of the dropouts reported a personal illness or physical disability. Two persons reported tuberculosis; one was blind; and one had a broken leg. One reported permanent injuries received in an automobile accident, and another was in poor health. In almost all cases these dropouts were under treatment or care.

Educational Characteristics

This part of the report discusses the last grade completed, reasons for leaving school, help sought and received in school, and the dropouts general feeling about school.

Twenty-seven dropouts, or 55 percent, attended Dunbar Senior High School, 16 or 33 percent, attended Shaw Jr. High School, and 6 dropouts, or 12 percent, attended Banneker Jr. High School.

TABLE 8.--LAST GRADE COMPLETED BY DROPOUTS, 1963

Grade completed	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
7th grade or under.....	11.8%	15.6%	7	14.3%
8th grade	41.2%	25.0%	15	30.6%
9th grade	17.6%	40.6%	16	32.7%
10th grade	17.6%	9.4%	6	12.2%
11th grade	11.8%	9.4%	5	10.2%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	
Mean grade	8.8	8.7	8.7	
Median grade	9	9	9	

The mean grade completed by dropouts was ninth grade (see Table 8). Over three-fourths of the dropouts completed nine or fewer grades -- about 81 percent of the girls, and 71 percent of the boys. About 10 percent of the dropouts completed eleventh grade, with about 12 percent of the boys and 9 percent of the girls completing the eleventh grade.

TABLE 9.--MAIN REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL

Reason	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
Pregnancy or Parentage	5.9%	62.6%	21	42.9%
Lack of interest	17.6%	12.5%	7	14.3%
Poor health	11.8%	15.6%	7	14.3%
Economic reasons	23.5%	3.1%	5	10.2%
Alienation	29.4%	3.1%	6	12.2%
Marriage	0.0%	3.1%	1	2.0%
Other	11.8%	0.0%	2	4.1%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	

About two-thirds of the girl-dropouts said pregnancy was their main reason for leaving school (see Table 9); and five of the boy-dropouts (29.4 percent) gave alienation (misbehavior or dislike of school) as their main reason for leaving school. Only one girl gave alienation as the cause of her withdrawal. Seven, or about 14 percent of all dropouts, gave poor health as their main reason for leaving school. An equal number gave lack of interest as their main reason. Only five, or 10 percent of all dropouts, gave economic reasons as their main cause for dropout.

Almost three-fourths of the dropouts did not seek help before leaving school (see Table 10). Moreover, only one male pupil admitted that he sought help of any kind; and that help was asked of a counselor. Six girls also sought help from school counselors; and one pupil sought help from her classroom teachers. Not one said that he sought help from his principal, parents or guardians.

TABLE 10.--HELP SOUGHT BY PROSPECTIVE DROPOUTS

Help sought	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
Classroom teachers	0.0%	3.1%	1	2.0%
Counselors	5.9%	18.8%	7	14.3%
Principal	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
Parent or guardian	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%
No one	82.4%	68.8%	36	73.5%
No response	11.7%	9.3%	5	10.2%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	

An attempt was made to ascertain the attitudes of dropouts toward certain school personnel (see Table 11; also Appendix A, Item IV). About one half of the dropouts indicated an interest in both classroom teachers and principals; and a little over one-third indicated an attitude of interest toward counselors. Approximately one-fifth of the dropouts would not respond to queries about their feelings toward school personnel. A larger percentage of girl-dropouts than boy-dropouts said they felt an interest toward their classroom teachers. Boys, on the other hand, felt a greater interest than girls in both their counselors and principals. Indeed, the highest interest evidenced toward school personnel was shown by boy-dropouts in their feelings toward their principals. About 65 percent felt "great" or "some" interest in them.

About 27 percent of the dropouts seemed to show "great" interest and about 31 percent "some" interest in their classroom teachers; and about a fifth, 20.4 percent, seemed either indifferent or evidenced lack of enthusiasm toward them. Eleven, or 22.5 percent, refused to respond. More than 32 percent showed indifference toward, and 10.2 percent lacked interest in their counselors. Sixteen percent would not respond. Either "great" or "some" interest in counselors was shown by 36.8 percent. More than half of the dropouts showed great or some enthusiasm toward their principals; and two percent showed lack of interest, 18.4 percent showed indifference, and 22.5 percent refused to respond.

Generally, dropouts had little to complain about school facilities or school curriculum. About 93 percent said school facilities and the curriculum were adequate. This may indicate that dropouts lack standards for comparison.

Delinquent Characteristics

Some of the dropouts reported involvements with police, one or more appearances in court, and incarceration one or more times in the past.

Twelve of the dropouts (24.5 percent) reported one or more involvements with the police. This included 8 of them (16.3 percent) who had been involved more than once. Among the boys, 8 of 17 (or 47.1 percent) reported one or more involvements with the police. Among the girls, 4 of 32 (or 12.5 percent) reported one or more involvements with the police.

Eight of the 12 dropouts involved with the police made one or more court appearances (16.3 percent of the dropouts). Of the eight, five appeared more than once in court. Among the boys, 6 of 17 (or 35.3 percent) appeared in court; and 2 of 32 (or 6.2 percent) of the girl-dropouts reported one or more court appearances.

Six of the dropouts (12.2 percent) had been incarcerated one or more times in the past. This means that half of those who had been

TABLE 11.--DROPOUTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Attitude	Percent by sex		Total	
	Male	Female	Number	Percent
Toward classroom teachers				
Dropouts showed great interest ...	11.8%	34.4%	13	26.5%
Dropouts showed some interest	35.2%	28.1%	15	30.6%
Dropouts showed indifference.....	11.8%	3.1%	3	6.1%
Dropouts lacked interest	11.8%	15.6%	7	14.3%
No response	29.4%	18.8%	11	22.5%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	
Toward counselor				
Dropouts showed great interest....	23.5%	18.8%	10	20.4%
Dropouts showed some interest.....	29.5%	15.6%	8	16.4%
Dropouts showed indifference	23.5%	37.5%	16	32.6%
Dropouts lacked interest	5.9%	12.5%	5	10.2%
No response	17.6%	15.6%	8	16.4%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	
Toward principal				
Dropouts showed great interest....	11.8%	25.0%	10	20.4%
Dropouts showed some interest	52.9%	28.1%	18	36.8%
Dropouts showed indifference.....	11.8%	21.9%	9	18.4%
Dropouts lacked interest.....	0.0%	3.1%	1	2.0%
No response	23.5%	21.9%	11	22.4%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	

involved with the police, and three-fourths of those who had made court appearances were incarcerated. Both of the girls who made court appearances had been incarcerated; and four of the six boys who appeared in court had been incarcerated.

V. FUTURE PLANS AND PROBLEMS

This section discusses the dropouts' plans and problems concerning employment and further education and training.

A great majority -- 73.5 percent -- of the dropouts indicated that they wanted to return to school (see Table 12). Among this group, 49 percent wanted to return to a public day school, and the remainder wanted to attend a trade school in the evenings.

TABLE 12.--FUTURE PLANS AND ASPIRATIONS

Plans	Percent by sex		Total	
	Boys	Girls	Number	Percent
Return to school	76.4%	71.8%	36	73.5%
Find employment	11.8%	12.5%	6	12.2%
Remain on job	11.8%	6.3%	4	8.2%
No plans	0.0%	6.3%	2	4.1%
No response	0.0%	3.1%	1	2.0%
Total percent	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
Total number	17	32	49	

Seventy-five percent -- 37 of the dropouts -- were unemployed, and only six of them indicated that they were actively seeking work. Thirteen others were willing to discuss the types of jobs they wanted. Out of 19 youngsters, 7 said they wanted clerical or sales jobs; 6 said domestic service; 2 said unskilled labor; and 4 said they would seek "any kind" of work. When asked what wages they expect, only seven (14.3 percent) of the dropouts attempted to give a figure. Four wanted wages between 46 and 50 dollars a week, and three wanted wages between 51 and 60 dollars a week.

Twelve of the dropouts (25 percent) were employed. These included three who were doing clerical and sales work, one doing domestic work, and eight performing unskilled labor. The number of employed included four who were employed on temporary jobs. Eight of the 12 employed dropouts said they liked their present work, but only four said they wanted to remain on their present jobs. One did not like his work, and three were indifferent about their work. When asked about advancement opportunities, five said their jobs offered opportunities for advancement, five said there were no opportunities, and two said they did not know.

Methods of obtaining employment varied. Four of the 12 were informed by friends of job openings; five found jobs without help; one used the United States Employment Service; and two used "other means" to find their jobs.

VI. FOLLOWUP OF DROPOUTS

The most important aspect of the rehabilitation project was a followup of a selected number of dropouts, in order to offer services which might encourage realistic planning for the future. To carry out these plans, the Future for Jimmy staff assigned a full-time caseworker and employed a part-time counselor for this specific assignment. The purpose of the followup program was to guide dropouts back into a regular school or training program which might provide basic educational and job skills.

Followup Procedure

Interview sheets, completed by interviewers were returned at varying times to the office after October first.[6] Of 140 pupils sought as dropouts, only 49 were verified as actual dropouts. They were given attention according to the immediacy of their plans. A letter was sent to each dropout offering an opportunity to discuss future plans for school and work. The initial followup was made with the 49 dropouts through this letter. The response to the letter was considered good. In addition, the office sent a letter to each of the schools to verify attendance of 32 pupils who stated they had returned to school.

Nature of Assistance and Services Provided

The staff offered direct service in terms of what the pupil wanted or requested, i.e., to return to day or night school, employment. The staff was available in the office as well as in neighborhood counseling centers. They also were available for visits to the home, often necessary to obtain additional data. Home visits were made first to those who indicated they would like help from the office for the purpose of returning to school or in finding employment. Many were suspicious at first but later were able to call the office for information after home visists were made and rapport established.

---

6 Interviewers went to the homes in pairs to establish rapport and obtain the necessary information. One interviewer talked to the parents, explaining the purpose of the visit; the second interviewer talked with the dropout. Information regarding neighborhood resources and the counseling centers was left with the family, urging them to contact the centers for assistance. The telephone number and the address of the office were given to some dropouts, parents and interested persons who later called for appointments.

The interview schedules indicated that most dropouts were interested in returning to school, as well as making some plan for their future (see Table 13). All dropouts who requested help were asked to come to the counseling centers to talk with the counselors. Other dropouts were asked to come to the office when convenient. In additional cases, when dropouts did not respond to the letter, and when findings during the interview had indicated a special need, home visits were made by the caseworkers and counselors.

As Table 13 indicates, 20 of 32 students who sought aid wanted help in returning to school. Eight dropouts, who were interested in returning to day school, were referred to the school superintendent's office for approval. When approval was received around October 28th, visits were made to five homes to encourage these students to return to the schools to which they were assigned. Of these five, three indicated plans to return to school immediately. One student was not able to return because there was no one to care for her child during the day. Also, she showed signs of pregnancy, although this was denied. Another dropout was ill, and it was doubtful whether she would be able to return to school. Two males returned to school but have since dropped out again due to the distance of the school assigned. They could not afford the busfare.

Ten dropouts stated a desire to attend night school and requested additional information. These were placed on a pending list for future disposition with the plan of contacting them at a later date closer to night school registration. Two dropouts were interested in returning to school, but were prevented from doing so because of pregnancy. These were referred to Webster School (for unmarried mothers) which, at the time, had a waiting list.

The follow-up of these students, for greater ease and adjustment, should have been a natural aspect of the counseling process, but due to limited staff and other responsibilities could not be done as effectively. Little effort could be made to follow-up many dropouts in need if they did not call the office for assistance.

Places of Contact

A breakdown of contacts with 41 dropouts reveals that 8 were seen in the counseling center; 6 were seen in the Future for Jimmy office, and 27 home visits were made (see Table 14). The neighborhood counseling centers were not used as planned. Several factors appeared to be involved. Dropouts did not readily seek help. They lacked money for carfare and baby sitters, as well as proper clothing. Finally, although the centers were located within neighborhood settings, the dark evening hours were not conducive for visits.

Of the eight dropouts seen in the counseling centers, three came in search of employment, with little desire to return to school on a full-

TABLE 13.--SERVICES REQUESTED AND PROVIDED

Services requested	Total Number	Total Percent	Disposition	Number
Employment	6	18.8%	Employment	
			Referred to agencies	4
			Placed on job	2
Assistance in returning to school			Assistance in returning to school	
Day school	8	25.0%	Day school, approved	8
Night school	10	31.2%	Night school, pending January placement	10
Webster School	2	6.2%	Sharpe Health School, referred	2
Clothing	3	9.4%	Clothing, referred to Hospitality House	3
Medical (clinic)	3	9.4%	Medical (clinic) referred to Gale Clinic	3
Total percent		100.0%		
Total number	32			32

time basis, and the remainder were interested in returning either to day school or night school. Five of the six pupils seen in the office were interested in employment; and of this number, two were also seen in the counseling centers for further consultation. Four of the six office callers were referred to free community employment services, and two were placed on jobs by the project staff.

Other special services were provided to dropouts. Two who were slated to return to day school were referred to Hospitality House for proper clothing. Three dropouts called the Jimmy office for assistance, were found to be pregnant, and found not to be receiving clinic treatment. They were referred to Gale School Clinic for medical attention and their names placed on a pending list for future disposition.

TABLE 14.--PLACE OF CONTACT

Place of contact	Total	
	Number	Percent
Counseling centers	8	19.5%
Jimmy's office	6	14.6%
Home visits	27	65.9%
Total percent		100.0%
Total number	41	

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents the highlights from the study and a conclusion. It also recommends improvements in the program for the rehabilitation of dropouts, based upon the experience gained in the three-month pilot program.

Summary

Identification of dropouts proved to be an important task of the rehabilitation staff. Of the 140 names of dropouts supplied by the three schools, only 49, or 35 percent, were located and confirmed as dropouts; 59, or 42 percent, were not located; and 32, or 23 percent, were in school. It cannot be inferred that the total number of reported dropouts in the District of Columbia will fall into these percentage patterns, but it may be predicted that a large percentage of dropouts will not be located and a substantial percentage of reported dropouts will be in schools other than those which expected them.

An examination of some personal characteristics of the dropouts was revealing. At variance with the national trend, two-thirds of the dropouts were female. Thirty-two (65 percent) of the dropouts were girls and 17 (35 percent) were boys. Their mean age was 17 years. All the boy-dropouts were single and four of them (24 percent) had one or more children or were fathers of an expected first child. Two of the boy-dropouts were supporting one or more children or were planning to support an expected child. Twenty-five (about 78 percent) of the girl-dropouts were single, and an almost equal number, 24 (75 percent) of the girl-dropouts had one or more children or were expecting their first or another child. About 75 percent of the girl-dropouts were supporting one or more children or expected to support a child.

An examination of the characteristics of the homes of the dropouts was equally revealing. Twenty pupils (about 41 percent) lived with one parent--their mothers; and 18 (36.7 percent) lived with both parents. Two lived with their fathers, one with a guardian, four with their husbands, and four others had other arrangements. The dropouts had an average of four brothers and sisters living in the same household. There was a median of eight persons (7.3 mean) living in the same household--a household which was contained in a house or an apartment with an average of five rooms. The great majority of the dropouts were long-time residents of the District of Columbia, and were not very mobile. They changed their place of residence a mean average of 1.1 times in the past three years. Eight (16 percent) of the heads of household were graduated from high schools), and eight finished 6 or fewer years of formal education. None of the heads of household was engaged in professional or skilled work. Fifty-seven percent were in domestic or unskilled work and 31 percent of the heads of household were unemployed. Fathers were said to be

the main source of support of 17 (35 percent) of the dropouts' families. In 26 percent of the families, mothers were the main source of support. Social security or pension funds were the main source of support for seven (14 percent) of the families; and husbands of dropouts and public welfare funds accounted for 8 percent each. Many dropouts do not come from healthy families. Twenty (about 41 percent) of the dropouts reported one or more members of their family to have some type of major illness or physical disability. About 12 percent of the dropouts themselves were ill or had some type of physical disability, but almost all of these cases under treatment or care.

An important finding among educational characteristics was that the mean grade completed by dropouts in 1963 was ninth grade. Other important findings relate to reasons for withdrawing, assistance sought, and the dropouts' attitudes. The largest percentage of girl-dropouts, 62.6 percent, gave pregnancy as their main reason for leaving school. The largest percent, 29.4 percent, or boy-dropouts gave alienation (misbehavior or dislike of school) as their main reason for leaving school. About three-fourths of the dropouts did not seek help before leaving school. Only seven sought help from school counselors and only one sought help from classroom teachers. Not one dropout sought help from his principal or from his parents or guardians. More than half of the dropouts showed great or some enthusiasm toward their principal and classroom teachers, but only 37 percent of the dropouts showed great or some enthusiasm toward their counselors.

About one fourth of the dropouts reported one or more involvements with the police, eight reported one or more court appearances, and six were incarcerated one or more times in the past. (Percentages are, respectively, 24.5, 16.3 and 12.2.)

The problems faced by dropouts are these: failure to find employment (75 percent); pregnancy (75 percent of the girl-dropouts had one or more children or more and 63 percent left school because of pregnancy); and illness or physical disability (12 percent). It is significant that among the aspirations and future plans of dropouts was the desire of 73.5 percent to return to school. Only six (12.2 percent) wanted to find permanent, full-time employment; and only four already employed wanted to remain on their jobs.

After interviewers had completed their home visits, the caseworker and counselor sent followup letters to those dropouts who did not call the office, and who failed to keep appointments made at the centers and the office. Letters were also sent to dropouts who did not contact the office at all. An unusual number of home visits were scheduled. Although some dropouts sought available services provided by the neighborhood counseling centers, the actual use of the centers was far below the anticipated use. To carry out the purpose of the project, additional home visits were made. Because of staff limitations, followup services were thus necessarily curtailed.

A major problem faced by the staff was that of timing. Interviewers began to work on October first. Almost a month had passed before the interview schedules were returned, sorted and processed. The effort, therefore, of helping the dropout return to school was hampered. The dropouts approved for re-admission to school faced not only a handicap of a two-month absence from school, but many had been transferred to schools out of their districts.

A lack of many services in the Washington community was observed by the staff, especially services dealing with the welfare of children. There was not only a lack of particular services, but long waiting lists existed for available services. There was, in particular, the lack of programs for the unmarried mother and father, as well as the lack of employment opportunities for untrained youngsters out of school, who fall into the 15 to 19 age bracket. The limited day care facilities for unmarried mothers with children was noted particularly.

Conclusion

The desire for an education was utmost in the minds of most of the students interviewed and assisted. An overwhelming majority indicated that they wanted to return to school, but only one-fourth of the dropouts were making an active effort to return. It is significant that only three of 49 dropouts returned to school. Two have since dropped out again because of financial hardships. Ten were scheduled to enter night school in January 1964. Another one-fourth of the dropouts were employed in jobs offering varying degrees of satisfaction and opportunities for advancement. Of the remaining unemployed, few had more than a vague idea of the type of jobs they wanted or the wages or salaries they would seek. Only six of 37 unemployed dropouts were actively seeking employment. About half of the dropouts were unable to return to school. For many of the girls, an immediate return to school, if not impossible, was unrealistic. Some were pregnant, and others were taking care of their own young children. Added to this number were a half-dozen ill or disabled ones, and an undetermined number whose lack of interest and lack of scholastic achievement make doubtful a successful learning experience in a regular school.

What becomes clear, therefore, is the need for an extensive action program to tackle the multiciplicity of problems that confront the junior and senior high school student in the District of Columbia. A program which would assist in strengthening families should be a part of a massive preventive plan. Few of the problems revealed in the study lend themselves to immediate solutions. A followup program of great depth is needed to provide the guidance and counseling necessary to return the dropouts to school or into training programs which will provide them with basic educational and job skills.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made for the revision of the program for the rehabilitation of dropouts in the light of the experience gained in this pilot project.

1. The interviewers were useful in locating and making initial contacts with dropouts. This saved a large amount of time for counselors and enabled them to concentrate on doing professional work. Nevertheless, this project indicated that a 4-hour training program for interviewers was not sufficient. At least an 8-hour training program with closer supervision is recommended.

2. The interview forms were found to be too lengthy and some of the information was irrelevant for the purposes of the study.

3. If possible, September dropouts should be interviewed in September in order to facilitate the immediate return of those who wish to continue their education.

4. Neighborhood counseling centers should be augmented by additional visiting counselors. One central office, opened 6 days a week should be sufficient. Most contacts with dropouts should be made with visiting counselors. Youngsters who have been often discouraged need some personal aggressive approach in order to help them make use of available services.

5. Funds should be allocated for general emergency use.

6. A closer working relationship is needed between the rehabilitation program and other social agencies.

7. A broad tutoring service should be made available, such as the Future for Jimmy tutoring program, for those dropouts who need assistance in remedial reading, English, and mathematics. Such a program must be adequately financed and staffed in order for it to be meaningful.

8. Intensive casework services should be made available to families of the dropout population.

9. A researcher with writing ability should be an active part of the rehabilitation program.

10. Periodic evaluations should be made in order to effectively offer realistic and needed services.

11. A group worker should be added to the staff.

12. A comprehensive community study plan should be an aspect of the over-all plan of the program.

13. There should be a referral plan in cooperation with the public schools for identifying potential dropouts.

14. This program should function on a three-year basis.

APPENDIX A

A FUTURE FOR JIMMY "DROPOUT" STUDY

Three Secondary Schools

I. Personal and Family Situation:

1. Name: _____ 2. School: _____

3. Address: _____ 4. Age: _____

5. Last grade completed: _____

6. Minor lives with: Both parents: _____ One parent: _____ Which? _____

Other (specify): _____

7. Number of brothers and sisters living in same household: _____

Number older: _____ Number younger: _____

8. Total number of persons in household: _____

9. Is household an apartment _____ or house _____ Number of rooms: _____

10. How long lived in D.C.: _____

11. How many times moved in last three years: _____

12. Number of times picked up by police: _____ Number of times picked up for actually doing something wrong: _____ Number of times in court: _____ Any time served in correctional institution: _____

13. Marital status of minor: _____ Number of own children: _____

14. Last grade completed by father _____ Mother: _____ Guardian: _____

15. Occupation of father: _____ Mother: _____ Guardian: _____

16. Main source of financial support for family: _____

Secondary sources of support: _____

_____

17. Is anyone in the household ill: _____ If so, who and what: _____

_____

How are they being treated: _____

18. Has anyone in household a physical disability: _____ If so,

who and what: _____

Are they receiving any aid or treatment: _____

II. School Status:

a. Are you returning to school? _____

b. If so, when? _____ Where? _____

c. Why did you not return on time? _____

_____

_____

d. Why did you leave in the first place? _____

_____

_____

e. If you are not returning, why not? _____

_____

_____

f. Did you seek help from any teachers, counselors, the principal or anyone else? _____ Who and what happened? _____

_____

_____

III. Future Action If Not Returning to School:

a. What are your plans? _____

_____

_____

b. If interviewee is looking for work:

1. What kind of job would you like? _____

2. Is anyone helping you find a job? _____

3. Do you have any job offers? _____

4. What do you expect to earn? _____

c. If interviewee is working:

1. What kind of job do you have? _____

2. Who helped you find your job? _____

3. Is the job permanent or temporary? _____

4. How much are you making? _____

5. Do you like your job? _____

6. Is there a chance for advancement? _____

d. Do you want to return to school? _____

_____

e. Have you heard about the many offices that can help you get employment? If so, have you been to any? _____

_____

_____

_____

f. Have you heard about any vocational training schools? _____

_____

g. Would you attend an evening school? _____

IV. What Are or Have Been Your Feelings About School?

a. The principal: _____

_____

b. Teachers: _____

_____

c. Counselors: _____

_____

d. Other students: _____

_____

e. Physical facilities: _____

_____

f. Subject Matter: _____

_____

g. Other comments: _____

_____

V. Interviewer's Evaluation: (Note rapport, setting, interruptions, and any other significant factors or incidents.)

APPENDIX B

"A FUTURE FOR JIMMY" DROPOUT STUDY

QUESTIONS FOR PARENTS OR GUARDIAN: (Name of minor: _____)

1. Name of parent or guardian: _____
2. Address: _____ 3. Relationship to minor: _____
4. Estimate age: _____ 5. How long lived at this address: _____
6. How long has minor lived with parent or guardian at this address: _____
7. How long has minor lived with parent or guardian altogether: _____
8. Continuously or intermittently: _____
9. Where else and with whom has the minor lived: _____
10. How old is the minor: _____ 11. Last grade completed: _____
12. School: _____ 13. Last time attended school: _____
14. Why has minor not attended since then: _____
15. Will he/she be returning to school? _____ When: _____ Where: _____
16. If not, why not: _____
17. Last grade completed by parent or guardian: _____
18. Where schooling was obtained: _____
19. How many times was minor absent from school last year? _____
20. Does school interest minor? _____ Why or why not: _____

_____

21. How do you feel about school? _____
22. Have you ever visited the school? _____ Who did you talk to? _____

_____ Reason for visiting: _____

Impression of that particular school: _____

23. Desire for future of minor: _____
24. Are you aware of consequences if minor does not return to school? _____

_____

25. Is anyone in the household ill? _____ If so, who and what? _____

_____

"A FUTURE FOR JIMMY" DROPOUT STUDY

INTERVIEWER'S EVALUATION AND COMMENTS:

1. Persons present: (List by relationship to minor where possible)

2. Setting: (Describe place where interview was held, its conditions, and reasons for conducting interview there)

3. Interference and interruptions: (Nature, by whom or what)

4. Attitude of minor: Friendly ____; Courteous ____; Cooperative ____; Cool ____; Aloof ____; Hostile ____; Other (describe): _____

_____(Rank numerically when more than one adjective applies.) Any further comments on rapport - the course it took, how it was established, initial reception, any incidents, etc.:

5. Rapport with others present: (Describe as in #4, who, what)

6. Anything else - incidents, remarks, etc.:

7. Interviewer's feeling about this particular situation:

Time interview began: _____ Ended _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Telford Benjamin Blough, A Critical Analysis of Selected Literature on the Problem of School Dropouts. Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Pittsburgh in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: the University, 1956, 359 pp.

Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Department of General Research, Budget, and Legislation, Office of Statistician, Pupil Entries from Maryland, Virginia, and Elsewhere and Reasons for Pupil Discharges, by Levels, from the Regular Day Schools, for the School Year, 1962-63. Washington, D. C.: the School System, July 10, 1963, 4 pp.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Information about dropouts: terms and computations," School Life, May 1963.

The New York Times, August 2, 1963.